

There are more non-Cantorian sets than are Cantorian

Zuhair Al-Johar

March 2025

1 Introduction

When working in NF, [1] there is a sense that there are more non-Cantorian sets than Cantorian sets. But it is not that immediate result as one expects, since they are externally equinumerous, and the qualification “Cantorian” is not stratified and so not easy to spell internally. This account stipulates a fairly simple criterion to phrase such problems and proves that per that criterion there are more non-Cantorian sets.

2 A criterion of comparison of predicate sizes

We say that a predicate P has strictly fewer objects that fulfill it than those that fulfill a predicate Q , denoted as $P \prec Q$, if and only if there is a set X of which every object fulfilling P is an element, and a set Y that has all its elements fulfilling Q , and $|X| < |Y|$.

The operator $|X|$ is defined, as usual in NF, after Frege, as the set of all sets that are bijective to X , [2] and the operator “ $<$ ” is defined, as usual, by Cantor, as the existence of an injective function from left to right and absence of it in the opposite direction. [3]

3 The claim and its proof

Claim: Cantorian \prec non-Cantorian

Where a set x is said to be Cantorian, if and only if, $|x| = |\iota x|$, where $\iota x = \{\{y\} : y \in x\}$. [4]

Proof: Let X be the set of all sets that are surjective images of ιV (i.e. there exist surjections from ιV onto each of them), where V is the set of all sets. Formally, $X = \{S : |S| \leq^* |\iota V|\}$.

Let $Y = \{V \times x : x \in V\}$, where the operator “ \times ” stands for the Cartesian product that uses the Quine-Rosser pairs. [5]

Every Cantorian set s would be an element of X , since s is injective to $\iota^{\omega}V$ and so s would be a surjective image of $\iota^{\omega}V$.

All elements of Y are non-Cantorian since they are V -sized, this is directly shown from Schröder–Bernstein theorem “SB”, [6] which NF proves, [4] and the maps $x \mapsto \langle 0, x \rangle; x \mapsto x$. Also we note that Y itself is V -sized by the maps $x \mapsto x \times V; x \mapsto x$.

The proof that $|X| < |Y|$:

Bowler in [7] has shown that the set of all surjective images of $\iota^{\omega}V$, is itself a surjective image of $\iota^{\omega}V$, so we have X is a surjective image of $\iota^{\omega}V$. Bowler’s proof involves the construction of a map: $\phi : \iota^{\omega}V \rightarrow V$, defined as:

$$\phi : \{C\} \mapsto \{\{s : \langle x, s \rangle \in C\} : x \in V\}$$

So, each $\phi(\{C\})$ is a surjective image of $\iota^{\omega}V$, and each S whereby there exists a surjection $F : \iota^{\omega}V \rightarrow S$, we take $C = \{\langle x, s \rangle : s \in F(\{x\})\}$, and we’ll have $S = \phi(\{C\})$. Consequently, X is the image of ϕ , which is a surjection from $\iota^{\omega}V$, that is, $X = \{S \mid \exists x \in \iota^{\omega}V : \langle x, S \rangle \in \phi\}$.

Now, X is injective to Y , since every set is injective to Y because Y is V -sized. However, Y cannot be injective to X , since otherwise this would mean that there exists a bijection between X, Y by SB, [6] but this would mean that V is a surjective image of $\iota^{\omega}V$. But that cannot be since it’s known that if B is a surjective image of A , then $\mathcal{P}(B)$ injects to $\mathcal{P}(A)$, accordingly we will have $\mathcal{P}(V)$ injecting into $\mathcal{P}(\iota^{\omega}V)$, and so V injects into $\iota^{\omega}V$ since $|\mathcal{P}(\iota^{\omega}V)| = |\iota^{\omega}V|$ by maps $x \mapsto \{\bigcup x\}; \{x\} \mapsto \iota^{\omega}x$; but by then V would be Cantorian, which is not!

4 References

1. Quine WV. New Foundations for Mathematical Logic. Am Math Mon. 1937;44:70–80.
2. Frege G. The Foundations of Arithmetic (Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik, with facing English text by J. L. Austin). Evanston: Northwestern University Press; 1976.
3. Cantor G. Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre (Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers, 1895–1897).
4. Holmes MR. Elementary set theory with a universal set [PDF]. Cahiers du Centre de Logique. Vol. 10. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Département de Philosophie; 1998. ISBN: 2-87209-488-1.
5. Rosser JB. Logic for Mathematicians. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1953.

6. Bernstein F. Untersuchungen aus der Mengenlehre. Math Ann. 1905;61:117–155.
7. Forster T. Scrapbook on Set Theory with a Universal Set. Preprint. 2025
Jan 1. p. 310. Available from: <https://www.dpmms.cam.ac.uk/tef10/NFnotesredux.pdf>.
Accessed 2025 Mar 7.